

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 400 N. York, President, G. V. Bennett, Secretary, and Treasurer, Address: Tribune Building, No. 14 Nassau Street, New York.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.**  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.  
Daily & Sunday, 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.  
Sunday only, 6 months, \$3.00; 3 months, \$1.50.

**FOREIGN RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.**  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Sunday only, 6 months, \$4.50; 3 months, \$2.25.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## Another Year of War.

The meeting of French and British war councils in Paris is more than an evidence of new and better co-ordinated military operations, it is one more authentic sign of the expectation and purpose of the French and British to go on with the war to the end. As for the Russians, we have the words of eminent German publicists to base a belief that there is no sign of weakening in the Slav state, and in addition there is the promise in Paris that Russia and even Italy will join in this council presently.

For those who cling to the Napoleonic precedent this new drawing together of the foes of Germany will recall that agreement signed by the foes of Napoleon on March 9, 1814, which sealed the doom of the great Emperor and dashed the last hopes he had cherished of making a separate peace with one of his antagonists.

In the military preparations foreshadowed by the Paris conference there is a guarantee of at least another year of war. Within this time the most sanguine believer in Allied victory by the strategy of attrition does not expect that German numbers will decrease to the point where decisive victory will be assured, though many believe that in the late summer their losses will compel the Austro-Germans to shorten their lines in the East and perhaps in the West.

The period of open campaigning of the old-fashioned sort stopped in the West in September, 1914. It terminated in the East in August of this year. The Austro-Italian campaign never passed this point and the Serbian campaign must be regarded as a minor detail, comparable to the Napoleonic venture in Spain, which, after temporary success, proved to be the ruin of many imperial reputations and the graveyard of unnumbered French conscripts.

As the situation now stands not one of the great nations engaged has suffered losses such as would lead it to make peace on terms now obtainable. France, the greatest sufferer, would become a vassal of Germany if she yielded now. To yield would be to lose the last hope of regaining Alsace-Lorraine, of clearing the Germans from the open Belgian frontier, and it would mean the payment of a huge indemnity and the sacrifice of colonies.

For Russia, peace now would mean the end of the dream of Constantinople, the surrender of Poland and the Courland. For the Romanoff dynasty it would mean the end, for only victory can now save off Russian revolution. Economically Russia would return to German control, and all that the war has meant in industry, as well as in nationalism and religion, would be sacrificed.

As for England, she has only begun to fight. With a population in England, Scotland and Wales about equal to that of Prussia, England lost less than 400,000 men in the first year, Prussia more than 1,900,000. At last all Britain and the Empire are awake to the nature of the German peril and to the realization that the best chance they will ever have to crush the most dangerous rival since Napoleon is in their own hands.

In Champagne, in Poland, and now in their drive to the Near East with Egypt as an objective, the Germans have struck blows at the existence of three great nations. They have been so far successful that peace now would mean a permanent peril to all these nations. Therefore not one of these nations can or will think of peace.

What is still little understood in America is that the war is a war for existence for France and for Great Britain. Germany has challenged the right of France to exist, of Great Britain to preserve her world empire. Her statesmen, her writers, her teachers have proclaimed the doctrine that France must be crushed, Great Britain eliminated as a world power, that on the ruins of the two national structures there might rise a Teutonic world empire.

What Germany has taught she has put in practice. A part, a material part, of the great project of Bernhardt has been realized. Sixteen months of war see Germany supreme from the Beresina to the Aisne and from the Baltic to the Golden Horn. A new expedition is already in preparation for the thrust at Egypt, and German agents are busy stirring up insurrections from Fex to Calcutta.

A year from now exhaustion without defeat may destroy the German ambition. A year from now all the great combatants may be ready to return to peace on a basis that all can accept. But there is no such basis now. Germany can not and will not consent to give up all her mighty conquests merely for peace, a peace that would bring a staggering and sterile debt. Germany's foes cannot agree to peace while their very existence is in danger.

Not until Germany has conquered or seen her world ambitions fade to ashes and felt the pressure upon her own frontiers of hostile armies and of want and misery within her boundaries is there hope that

Germany will consent to return to the Europe of August, 1914, and not until they are conquered can Britain, France or Russia agree to any other conditions of peace.

Napoleon at the zenith of his power was ready for peace that left France supreme in Europe, but ultimately his enemies, the states he had invaded and crushed, as Germany has failed to crush her opponents, realized that only when France had returned to her old frontiers and the dream of world empire had been laid in the blood and ashes of defeat could there be a peace in Europe which permitted all nations to enjoy existence.

The war in Europe must go on because the issue of the war is not a province or a principle. In 1871 peace was possible because Germany sought only a frontier and unity. For the loss to France of Alsace and Lorraine Europe cared little, because it did not seem to destroy the balance of power. Germany, Italy and Austria could make peace in 1866 because no major European question was at stake.

To-day no peace is possible because the issue is the independence of Europe, and the independence not merely of Belgium and Serbia, but of France, and the existence of the British Empire are imperilled by German supremacy at Constantinople, and Italian safety is destroyed if Austria remains a German subject-nation, with German naval power seated on the Adriatic at Trieste, Cattaro, and to-morrow at Valona.

The war will go on because there is not a single point of agreement conceivable between the contestants. The German dream of world empire is still within the Kaiser's grasp on any basis of peace that can to-day be proposed. Spain and France fought for European supremacy. They in turn endeavored to reproduce the Roman system and the Roman sway. They failed, but until their failure was definitive permanent peace was impossible. Germany is to-day playing the same rôle. There can be no peace until she, too, abandons it.

Nothing is more foolish or more futile to-day than talk or thought of peace, particularly among neutrals. There can be no peace for men fighting for their lives until life is assured. There can be no assurance of life for France, Russia or Great Britain until the German dream of world power has been destroyed. It took Europe ten years to dispose of the Napoleonic menace—it will take a shorter time to dispose of the German, because it is Napoleonism with Napoleon left out, but the time for peace is still far in the future.

Fortunately for France and Great Britain—for the world, as The Tribune believes—the peril of complete German success has been disposed of. France, Russia and Great Britain keep the field with growing power and unshaken will. The blood tax on Germany has begun to tell; the British naval noose has been drawn to suffocation. German advance has terminated in the East and the West; only in the Balkans is there progress still.

All doubt of the outcome of the war as a military problem has passed. Such doubt as there might be as to the endurance and will of the Allies diminishes in the face of recent evidence, of which the Paris conference is but one detail. But one, perhaps two years more of war are seemingly inescapable, for peace is impossible while those who rule Germany cling to the belief that it is within their power to organize Europe, dominate the lesser peoples and build upon the ruins of French, British and Russian empires the structure of "Deutschland über Alles."

## Letting Nature Have Her Way.

A surgeon of Chicago has made it known that he is resolved to let one of his patients die. The circumstances of the case are sufficiently perplexing to account for the variety of opinions expressed upon the wisdom and essential justice of this decision, but if the surgeon's own views on the matter are really what they are represented to be by the reporters to whom he seems to have talked with such wonderful freedom, and even eagerness, they suffice in themselves to justify all the misgivings of his severest critics.

The particulars of the case have not been published. The surgeon seems to have been too much occupied in discussing ethical questions to find time to tell the world what he was actually confronted with. It is to be gathered, however, that the patient is an infant, and the main point is that he is destined to die, though he might be saved by a surgical operation. By what operation we are not told, and touching his ailment all we know is that he came into the world with certain "physical flaws," which, the surgeon says, "would undoubtedly make him an invalid during his first year." This alone could hardly be accepted as a sufficient reason for letting the boy die, but the surgeon has a more potent reason: he thinks that if the boy lived he would "probably" be defective. On the strength of this probability he decided, according to the accounts, to let him die, or, as he puts it, to let Nature take her course.

It is difficult, not knowing the conditions, to determine exactly what Nature is driving at in this interesting case. The surgeon seems to be satisfied that she is prepared to correct what she, no less than he, recognizes as a grave blunder. The child could be saved, but saving it would be interfering with Nature, who would be revenged not on the child alone but possibly on its offspring. "Defectives," he says—or so the reporters make him say—are prolific. It would reproduce its kind, and these initial deformities would be magnified and multiplied.

This is remarkable, because it appears that the mother is a multipara with three "fine healthy children," and that there is nothing at all to indicate a family taint on her side or the father's. Upon what reason he concludes that the "physical flaws" would be multiplied in future generations he does not say, but that perhaps may be allowed to pass as a minor consideration, the principal one being the

probability of inferiority in the child itself. Apart from all questionable speculations on the heritability of the flaws, it will occur to some critics to ask whether the surgeon is right in assuming that he is answerable only to his own conscience, inasmuch as the case was "given him to decide." It is very true that we cannot be sure how strong the reasons are for his decision, but according to the reports he is acting on a probability. Is this a very safe course? Certain forms of mental deficiency which seemed hopeless some years ago are enormously improved to-day when treated with thyroid gland; there is now reason to believe that others may in some measure be benefited by neo-salvarsan. These probably have no relation whatever to the particular case under consideration, but they justify a doubt as to the safety of suffering doctors to decide whether to let men live or die by what they conceive to be probabilities. Some of them might be well guided, but to allow them so much liberty is to extend their function in a dangerous measure. Doctors as yet are neither gods nor executioners.

## Museological Ptomaines.

It is rather unfortunate that sandwiches and the Museum of Natural History should be linked, though momentarily, in the public mind, since New York, raised on the Raines law, are only too familiar with a species of sandwich whose only proper habitat would be the Museum of Natural History. The horrid thought that such might finally have found lodgement there will give them all the more anxiety for the wellbeing of Commissioner and Mrs. Kingsbury and Dr. Wile, and will excite, too, their profound sympathy in the indisposition of these distinguished fellow townspeople.

But there may be some comfort in remembering that every day sees fresh demonstrations of the power of suggestion. No one can deny that sandwiches eaten at the museum are eaten in an unpleasantly suggestive environment. Could this circumstance alone have caused the illness of the Kingsburys and Dr. Wile? It will be impossible to say with any certainty, of course, until Dr. Haven Emerson, the Commissioner of Health, has completed his analysis of one of the unhappy sandwiches served at the Monday evening meeting. But if suggestion is actually the culprit we may look for a speedy recovery of the three invalids.

And in the mean time we may solace ourselves with Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn's argument against a more serious cause: "Many of the best known scientific men in the country were at the meeting, and none of them was ill in the morning." Scientists, as every one knows, are suggestion proof. If their stomachs had rebelled we might well have been alarmed.

## Liberties of the Picture Dealer.

A well known London firm of picture dealers, who at one time had a branch in this city, endeavored lately to recover damages of a dealer in Bath for alleged false and fraudulent representations in the sale of certain sketches attributed to Constable. The particulars need not at present be considered; suffice it that the purchasers of the sketches depended mainly for their claim upon the following letter written by the defendant when asked to give the pedigree of his supposed Constables:

I purchased them about five or six months ago from an old lady shortly before her death. She told me that the sketches belonged to her father, who was an artist's model, and he got them from "Constable." I purchased from her about seventy or eighty, in fact everything in picture line she had. Some more I am sending on to you. The old lady's name was "Golfani"; her husband was an Italian or some foreigner. The name of her father, "the artist's model," I forgot to ask about.

The buyers found that on the margins of several were the words "J. Constable, R. A." or "J. Constable fecit," but afterward learned that in reality they were done by one Warren, and having reason to believe that the story about the old lady called Golfani was a pure invention, they proceeded to sue the dealer of Bath. At the trial the defendant admitted that he had been told the sketches were Warren's, but that, he said, might mean that they came from Warren's collection. As to Mrs. Golfani, he confessed that she was an imaginary person, but he was obliged to invent her, "knowing how dealers in London tried to find out the source of such things." As to the signatures, it was true that he had inscribed them himself, but the sketches had been offered to him as "very clever things," and seeing he himself thought they were Constable's, the mere writing of the name was no violation of his conviction.

The interesting upshot was that the jury disagreed. Apparently the confession of lying was not regarded by all as impressive. Does this mean that the old principle of caveat emptor is unlimited in its application, or that there is something in the very nature of picture dealing that justifies a free exercise of the imagination?

John Dementor, the aviator, who hailed Miss Liberty while upside down in the air, enjoyed an aspect entirely in keeping with the times.

No Reprials on Kitchen—Headline.

Not so long as the legislative pantry continues to satisfy.

The Allies will not have Turkey for Thanksgiving, this year.

## Liberia's Neutrality Violated.

(From the Springfield Republican.)  
Alleged violations of Liberia's neutrality by Germany, especially through its wireless telegraph system, are said to be annoying France. Protests to the United States, which is regarded as Liberia's patron, may result. The United States could, of course, make representations to Liberia or Germany, or both, in the matter, but American patronage of the little African republic is not of the possibility sort. The capital of Liberia is Monrovia, in honor of the American President, but the Monroe Doctrine applies to this continent only.

## "REMEMBER THE LUSITANIA"

Comment of Reader of a Recent Tribune Editorial.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: To the gentleman who wrote the recent editorial on the British mistake and the remembrance of the Lusitania, will you please convey my sincere appreciation? Than the last one, no article has stirred my blood more since the days of the Civil War, because manifestly it came from a heart wrung with the sense of utter helplessness in the hour when our country, blindfolded, I sadly fear, is groping her way among the hot ploughshares.

Of course we are not the people North or South who fought the war to a finish. Despite the circumstance that we were all of us, earlier or later, imported, we were substantially a homogeneous people. We are so no longer, and I greatly fear that ease, comfort, success have so developed the pocket nerve that it is really the only one that is responsive.

It amazes me to see one newspaper after another of those I have been accustomed to read joining in a war dance over the protest to England and the necessity of enforcing it. Cannot the author of these two articles give us one which may help to open the eyes of those of us who are riding for a sure fall? They seem to think that it's enough to say, "Oh, England will never go to war with us!" Which may be true enough; but why need she? Already one sees suggestions in the daily press as to what might be the situation if we were left to maintain the Monroe Doctrine without a friend in the world.

New York, Nov. 13, 1915. READER.

## Americanism First.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: As a daily reader of The Tribune your editorials on the pusillanimous attitude of the Washington government (President Wilson) as to the murdering of American citizens on the high seas console me a little for being an American whose paternal ancestor landed on these shores prior to 1645. Where are the statesmen, if we have any, placing themselves on record as to whether this is a nation, with a position among the powers of the world, or simply a dumping ground for the countries of the world, or for those who come here to get what there is here, but still retain their love and allegiance to the land from which they have fled for the purpose of enjoying liberty and improving their material condition?

Colonel Roosevelt seems to be the only Presidential politician (pardon the word politician, but it expresses my thought) who has strongly expressed himself on the murdering highwayman, the German government; and I am of the opinion that this is a good time for the several Republican aspirants for the nomination for the Presidency to place themselves on record as to their Americanism, unphlegmated.

HENRY C. WEEKS.  
Mamaroneck, N. Y., Nov. 15, 1915.

## Mr. Wilson's Accomplishment.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: "The New York World" in an editorial in its issue of the 12th instant has the following: "All that has been gained in the way of subjecting German submarine warfare to the rules of international law has been gained by President Wilson, but American diplomacy cannot undertake to do the work of the British navy," and as a heading to the above asks this question: "But What Is the British Navy Doing?"

Will "The World" kindly tell us what the German navy is doing? What has it done, and what does it propose doing, and what has President Wilson done to subject German submarine warfare to the rules of international law? For answer I would ask "The New York World" to carefully read the excellent editorial in The Tribune of the 11th instant under the head "A Second Lusitania."

"American diplomacy" as represented by President Wilson "cannot undertake to do the work" of its own navy, far less interfering with that of the most powerful navy the world has ever seen.

MRS. JOHN B. CAMPBELL.  
New York, Nov. 13, 1915.

## Our Rights as Americans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I read with much pleasure your editorial of to-day, "Pitiless Publicity." It was a message that must strike a note of patriotism in a heart truly American, but perhaps dulled and stagnant, due to the "new patriotism" established by the present administration. A man's sense of duty between right and wrong may be prompted by any of many motives, my idea being that we should uphold at any cost the honor of our country and our rights as Americans, fought for and given to us by our forefathers, and to be willing at all times to fight for, if needs be, the cause of justice and righteousness.

JOHN R. BOWMAN, Jr.  
Putnam, Conn., Nov. 15, 1915.

## Forgotten Ideals.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Please allow me to thank you most cordially for your magnificent editorial on the new patriotism ["Remember the Lusitania"] as copied in to-day's "Boston Transcript."

One can only hope that its meaning, carried by the biting and burning words in which you clothe it, may filter into the placid brains in Washington before we have fallen much further in the world's esteem.

What becomes of Wilson's loudly trumpeted idealism that brought him the votes of many good men, in view of his perpetual disregard of it in his political actions? L. C. PARKER.  
Auburndale, Mass., Nov. 15, 1915.

## Reprint Them!

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: May I congratulate you on your splendid editorials entitled "Remember the Lusitania" and "Pitiless Publicity." I should be glad if, as was suggested, they could be published in pamphlet form. I want to send several copies to my friends abroad, who are beginning to think the United States too indifferent or too weak to protect the lives of its citizens.

M. E. DECOURBEY.  
Bryn Mawr, Penn., Nov. 15, 1915.

## Appreciated.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Your editorial in this morning's Tribune is the strongest one that I have read in regard to our duty in the matter of protection to our own people, averting future danger, maintaining our national ideals and further doing the things that we owe to the world and civilization. I am thankful for your courage in coming out so plainly.

WILLIAM G. BUTTON.  
Philadelphia, Nov. 15, 1915.

## The New Patriotism.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Appreciation is expressed for your new patriotism editorial ["Remember the Lusitania"] reprinted in "The Boston Evening Transcript" of yesterday. A friend tells me he mailed a copy to London to-day, so I am not alone.

LINCOLN RIGTER.  
Boston, Nov. 16, 1915.

## ASSISTANCE.



## NOTE TO FOLLOW NOTE

Lusitania Precedent in Our Controversy with England.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Germans must have a keen sense of humor, despite reports to the contrary. The comments of the German press on President Wilson's note to England show real humor. They express some doubt that our letter-writing President will follow words with action if the necessity should arise.

How ridiculous! Of course President Wilson will follow his words with action, but the action will consist of reaching for another sheaf of paper and penning another literary masterpiece to England. He may even tell England that the seizure of another American ship will be considered a distinctly discourteous act.

If President Wilson had followed his words to Germany with real action the Ancona outrage would not have occurred. Reparation for the Lusitania victims, whose bodies are scattered over the sands of the ocean, would have been made. There would not have been any attack made on the Arabic, but then the President would not have gained a diplomatic "triumph."

If President Wilson had followed words with action—the kind of action that Theodore Roosevelt would have taken had he been at the helm of the country—Americans would not be despised in Mexico. Americans would not have been forced to stand impotently by while filthy bands of Mexican outlaws outraged their women. American sailors and soldiers would not have been slaughtered by outlaw bands.

In the face of the action that has been taken with Germany and Mexico does any sane man really believe for one instant that England will heed the latest note? Downing Street will probably answer it, but the answers will probably be about as elucidating as the German notes on the Lusitania case were.

Democratic newspapers must have a wonderful sense of humor when they comment on the "triumphs" of the administration's foreign policy—how President Wilson has kept us out of war. People have a different name for the man who allows every person to ride roughshod over him and does not retaliate. That is just what the United States has been doing.

May the good Lord deliver us from another Wilson, who appears to be actuated in everything he does from the political point of view. Give to us another Roosevelt. He made his mistakes, but any man who does things makes mistakes. Roosevelt's own pet term, "mollycoddle," fits the man who does nothing but trim his sails for the political winds.

Of course, the Chicago beef barons haven't anything to do with the note to England. It was directed solely by the master mind of President Woodrow Wilson. Now if he could only send Pacific Bill Bryan along with it what a load of junk we would get rid of at one time! But then, it is brutal to wish anything like the perpetual Presidential candidate on the English. Why not send him to the Kaiser to revenge the Lusitania's death? Ezekiel and his trumpet might go along, too.

New York, Nov. 12, 1915. P. P.

## Possible Price of Peace.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: We are now having a recurrence of the epidemic of secretly instigated lawlessness which swept the country a few months ago; we are also, in the sinking of the Ancona, face to face with another Lusitania crisis. Where will it all end? When will it all end?

Under the guise of a strict neutrality we have watched and waited in ignominious supineness, while within our borders have been brazenly perpetrated the most flagrant and insolent violations of our status as an impartial non-combatant. We have protested, yes; we shall probably continue to protest. Of what avail are protests in a situation such as now confronts us, such as has confronted us—daily growing worse instead of better—since the outbreak of the European war?

The time for "strict accountability" notes is past; so is the time for toleration of inter-

## ference with and destruction of our legitimate industries; of being content with technical evasions of the questions at issue, or of a studied ignoring of our official communications concerning them; of accepting without emphatic resentment the inexcusable outrages being daily visited upon us; of playing politics with preparedness. Are we cowards? Are we "too proud to fight"? What ails us, anyway?

The pacifist's slogan is "Peace at any price!" God forbid. To plunge this country into war would, indeed, be a calamity. To find ourselves suddenly—but not without due warning, if we would but heed that which is going on around us—rent by internal disorders and, at the same time, attacked from without, would be an infinitely greater calamity. And that is precisely what we are speeding toward; is what will happen to us unless events take a decided turn for the better; which isn't at all likely.

Prating vainly of a great diplomatic triumph, trusting implicitly in the efficacy of the doctrine of the higher humanity, is almost ludicrously childish. With men's passions inflamed as they are throughout practically the entire world to-day; with strife, pillage, rapine, treachery and universal chaos rampant, what right have we to expect, to hope even, that a soft word will turn away the wrath of warring mankind, or scholarly phrases stem the tide of a world crisis?

If this be jingoism, then is the writer a jingo. But it isn't jingoism—as this country is destined to learn at no remotely distant day.

HOMER DUNNE.  
Yonkers, N. Y., Nov. 11, 1915.

## Depopulated Poland.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: One statement made by your Petrograd correspondent, M. Tchekosoff, in his article in The Tribune of November 9 calls for a correction without which it would be misleading. He says: "Of the 14,000,000 inhabitants of the provinces occupied by the Germans, 6,000,000 have fled before the advance of the modern Huns. I do not wish to dispute his figures, the accuracy of which neither he nor any one else is in a position to judge, except, perhaps, a few Russian and German officials who do not usually vouchsafe information of any kind to the public. What M. Tchekosoff should have said is that these 6,000,000 people fled, not before the advance of the modern Huns, but before the retreat of the Cossacks. It is now fairly well known that the Russians laid waste the whole country behind them as they retired, burning cities, towns, villages and farms and even compelling the wretched peasants to burn their crops and pasture to prevent their use by the German troops. Statements to this effect have appeared in The Tribune and other American newspapers, as well as in the English and German press, and may be accepted as accurate, for they are in full accord with well known Russian military methods. It is conceivable that such vast numbers have fled into the interior of Russia, but they were escaping not from the Huns, but from a desert. When cities of the size of Brest-Litovsk, with a population of 50,000, are burned to the last stick, it is evident that the inhabitants must fly elsewhere, and it is equally evident that they would not be permitted to go in the direction of the German lines.

Of the 8,000,000 who, as M. Tchekosoff tacitly admits, remained behind in the conquered provinces the great majority belong to the purely Polish and Jewish elements, and have welcomed the Huns with open arms, regarding them as deliverers.

In these warlike times it is almost impossible to hear unbiassed opinions on any subject connected with the great conflict, even from those who, one would think, should be truly neutral. But it makes one smile to hear a Cossack talking of "the Huns."

EDGAR DE HOND.  
Porch Lake, N. Y., Nov. 11, 1915.

## A Question of Values.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Would you please tell me through your paper why an American life is so valuable on a British ship and so worthless on American soil—viz., along the Mexican border?

Grahamsville, N. Y., Nov. 6, 1915.

## INJUSTICE TO WEST POINTERS

Its Graduates Handicapped in Gaining Entrance to the Army.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: In regard to the shortage of officers that will exist in our army in time of war and the function which West Point fills in the regular service, there are several points that do not seem to have had consideration. First, records will show that seldom, if ever, has the cadet corps been up to the maximum provided for by law. This is due to two causes. The time of examinations is so fixed that if a candidate from a given district fails in his entrance examinations the vacancy which he was to fill must remain open for an entire year. Again, the laws are such as to discourage any man who wishes to enter the military profession from doing so through the gateway of the academy.

Vacancies in the officer ranks of the army are filled first from the graduating class at West Point; second, from the enlisted men of the army; third, from certain military schools selected by the War Department, and, finally, from civilian life. Now, notice the difference in requirements. The law says in effect to the West Pointer: "You are being sent to the best military school in the world. You will have the best system of instruction that can be devised; all your education will be along military lines and will have for its object to graduate you as nearly a perfect officer as it is possible to produce. But, in spite of all this, our solons do not consider that you will be fit to wear shoulder straps and take your place among the other officers of the army until your full four years are up."

To the enlisted man, however, the statement is different. Although it is conceded that the education at West Point is probably the best military education to be obtained in the world, it is by law declared so far inferior to that obtained in the enlisted ranks of the army that, while four years are required at West Point, only two are required in the ranks in order to gain a commission. An illustration taken from my own experience will show how this works out. I took the entrance examinations with a man whom I will designate as A. I passed and A failed. I put in my four years and after a year's service met A, also an officer, at a manoeuvre camp. He had been commissioned from the ranks two years before I was commissioned from West Point, and, as we were both in the same branch of the service, he ranked me just those two years.

The case of men commissioned from military schools is not so flagrant, but is nevertheless also unjust to West Pointers. But the commissioning of civilians who have never had any military training, but who have political pull, is criminal.

The answer is naturally to abolish West Point instead of enlarging it, as you have advocated. It costs the people of the United States millions of dollars, and takes a great number of officers away from their regiments for administration and educational purposes. If Congress feels, as it evidently does, that two years in the ranks, or four years in a run-for-profit military school, or the exercise of their own judgment in selecting civilians from their own constituents—all produce officers equal to and therefore entitled to rank with the graduates of West Point, why maintain West Point at all? It is obviously a useless expenditure of money at a time when government receipts are already far behind the expenditures.

In view of such discrimination it is not to be wondered at that West Point is not an attractive proposition to a man who desires a military career; and I venture to say that the commissioning of civilians who have never had any military training, but who have political pull, is criminal.

Without conceit, I believe our commercial standards would be higher and our country better if hundreds of thousands of men with West Point ideas were injected into our civilian life. But my advice, under present conditions, to any man who wishes to select the military as his life profession would be without question to let West Point alone and enter the commissioned ranks of the army through one of the other avenues.

J. B. W. GARDINER.  
New York, Nov. 13, 1915.